DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 261 CE 008 342

AUTHOR Bowers, Ellen
TITLE Occupational Education Information Needs and Governance Patterns in Selected California Community Colleges.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; *Community Colleges; *Decision Making; *Governance; *Information Needs; Junior Colleges; *Needs Assessment; Program Planning; Tables (Data); Technical Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

Using the DELPHI technique, 111 individuals identified as management team members for occupational education (in eight selected California community colleges), were chosen for this study designed to provide information perceived to be needed and useable for effective planning of occupation education in community colleges in California. Three communication rounds used to acquire the information, involved participant ratings of the following eight decision areas on an 11-point continuum in relation to degree of importance for educational plannin : Program goals, program objectives, program planning, advisory committees, operational budget, coordination and direction, evaluation, and emphasis on occupational counseling, guidance, and placement. A total of 193 information factors were generated within the eight areas. (Overall ranking and independent ranking by college is provided in tabular form for each information factor.) Statistical analysis of the data indicated a significantly high relationship between institutions and management teams' perceived importance of information factors which would be needed and useable for effective planning for occupational education. Information factors relating to commitments and attitudes were ranked most important. Factors relating to facilities, equipment, and staffing requirements were ranked lowest. Of the eight decision areas, evaluation received the highest overall ranking. In relation to governance, most occupational education decisions are perceived to be made by the dean of instruction; the chief occupational administrator is perceived to make decisions about the advisory committee area. (TA)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED132261

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION INFORMATION NEEDS AND GOVERNANCE PATTERNS IN SELECTED CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By

ELLEN BOWERS

Research Conducted Under Small Grants Program
The Chancellor's Office California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

For more complete report, refer
to unpublished dissertation...

CE 008 342

INTRODUCTION

What is the real basis for decisions? political considerations? individual egos? organizational imagery? real or imagined needs? relevant data? or some combination of these? What is the real basis for decisions in educational institutions? Research indicates that the quality of the decision is directly related to the amount of information used in making that decision. Adams and Swanson (1) concluded that "the accuracy of an estimate is largely determined by the estimator himself" (p. 109). They also found that "...over 65 percent of the variation in accuracy was explained by the amount of information sought and processed..." (p. 109).

While there is no doubt that the good judgment of the decision maker is essential, that good judgment can be supplemented by relevant, accurate, and timely information. This study is an attempt to develop the blue print for an information needs assessment for occupational education for California community colleges.

Statement of the Problem

Decision makers for occupational education have, throughout the past, had to rely on their personal experiences, attitudes, and values to formulate recommendations and decisions for the planning of occupational programs. The simplistic era of yesteryear when personal judgments sufficed has vanished. With a wide variety of clientele to serve, with accountability and evaluation impacting, and with complicated alternatives to consider, an information base from which to launch decisions is an imperative for effective planning for occupational education. This study has been designed to begin to provide the information perceived to be needed and usable for the effective planning of occupational education in community colleges in California.

Objectives of the Study

The long-range goal to which this study contributes is to begin to move the management of post-secondary occupational education in California toward a more systematic, information-based approach to decision making. The operational objective of this study is to determine the information perceived to be needed and usable for effective planning by the management teams of selected community colleges in California. Specific objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the members of the occupational management teams for each of the eight selected California community colleges;
2. To identify the information factors perceived to be needed and usable by the occupational education management teams of the eight selected community colleges;
3. To rank the information factors submitted by the members of the eight occupational educational management teams;
4. To identify the information factors deemed to be essential by each occupational management team;
5. To determine the governance patterns of occupational education as evidenced by the hierarchical level at which a decision is perceived to be made; and
6. To obtain demographic data about the members of the occupational management teams.

Identification of the Population

The study has as its population the management teams for occupational education from eight California community colleges. In 1972-73, these eight community colleges had been selected as a ten percent representation of the community college system.

For purposes of this study, it was assumed that the eight community colleges, Porterville College, San Jose City College, American River College, West Hills College, Santa Barbara City College, San Diego City College, College of the Redwoods,

and Riverside City College, retained their representativeness of the California community college system. These community colleges are all established institutions having been in existence from 12 years to 72 years.

To establish the occupational management team members, a letter was sent to the chief occupational administrator at each college explaining the purpose of the study and requesting a designation of the individuals who were involved with the management of occupational education at that college. One hundred-eleven individuals were identified as management team members for occupational education in the eight institutions.

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The data in Table I indicates the number of management team members from each of the eight community colleges. Additionally, the relative size, as determined by the Chancellor's Office, is based on occupational education average daily attendance.

TABLE I

OCCUPATIONAL MANAGEMENT TEAM PARTICIPANTS

College	College Size	Mgt. Team Number	Percent of Total
College of the Redwoods	Medium Small	7	6.3
San Diego City College	Medium Large	12	10.8
Santa Barbara City College	Medium Small	18	16.2
San Jose City College	Medium Large	14	12.6
American River College	Large	43	38.7
West Hills College	Small	6	5.4
Riverside City College	Large	4	3.6
Porterville College	Small	7	6.3
TOTAL		111	99.9

The data in Table II indicates the occupational areas of members within institutions as well as the hierarchical level of the member's position. The areas were identified and classified on the basis of title and whether the title contained commonly accepted occupational identifiers. Eighty-eight men, 79.8 percent, and 23 women, 20.7 percent, were nominated as management team participants.

TABLE II

DESIGNATED MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS' ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND AND LEVEL

Institutional Area	Hierarchical Levels						
	District	Administrative	Divisional or Director	Departmental	Coordinator/ Supervisor	Instructor	Total
Agriculture & Industrial Technology						1	1
Administration of Justice				3	1		4
Business and Office				11		3	14
Career Placement and Work Experience			1	1	2		4
Data Processing				2			2
Fire Science					1		1
General Occupational Education	2	7	1	4			14
Health Occupations			6	3	1		10
Home Economics				2½*			2½
Hotel & Restaurant Management				1			1
Industrial				6½*	3		9½
Technical				9			9
Other:							
General Administration		18					18
Academic & Related			1	15	1	4	21
TOTAL FREQUENCY	2	25	9	58	9	8	111
PERCENT	1.8	22.5	8.1	52.2	8.1	7.2	99.9

*One individual reported chairing a combined department

Instrumentation

The DELPHI technique was used to collect the data. The DELPHI technique is a written communication process enabling a meeting of the minds through the use of carefully designed questionnaires which elicit individualized brainstormed responses. The responses form the information feedback base which is communicated to all participants in successive rounds until a convergent opinion is reached. Three communication rounds were used to acquire the information perceived to be needed and usable in eight decision areas.

Communication No. 1 contained eight decision areas identified from California Occupational Program Evaluation System COPES: Program Goals, Program Objectives, Program Planning, Advisory Committees, Operational Budget, Coordination and Direction, Evaluation, and Emphasis on Occupational Counseling, Guidance and Placement. In response to Communication No. 1, the management team members submitted information factors perceived to be needed and usable for the eight decision areas. In Communication No. 2, participants were asked to rate each factor on an 11-point continuum in relation to its degree of importance for effective planning within the specific decision area.

For Communication No. 3, the median response for each information factor was identified and marked on its separate eleven-point continuum. All participants were asked to evaluate the median ranking of each factor. If the median ranking was not consistent with the respondent's views, the respondent re-marked a point on a second "importance" continuum and supported the position through a written reason(s) in the "Comments" column. The return patterns of the participating institutions are illustrated in Table III.

Decision Area Rankings

There were a total of 193 information factors generated by the study--ninetten factors relating to the decision area of Program Goals, 17 factors relating to the decision area of Advisory Committees, 24 factors relating to Program Objectives

decision area, 39 information factors relating to the decision area of Operational Budget, 20 information factors needed for the decision area of Program Planning, 21 factors relating to the Evaluation decision area, 38 information factors needed for the Coordination and Direction decision area, and 15 information factors identified for the decision area of Emphasis on Occupational Counseling, Guidance, and Placement.

TABLE III

PARTICIPANTS' RETURN RATES TO COMMUNICATIONS NO. 1, 2, AND 3

College	Team Members	First Response	Second* Response	Third** Response
Porterville College	7	3	2	4
San Diego City College	12	6	4	6
Santa Barbara City College	18	5	5	12
Riverside City College	4	1	1	3
San Jose City College	14	7	5	9
West Hills College	6	3	3	2
American River College	43	16	11	22
College of the Redwoods	7	5	3	6
TOTAL	111	46	34	64
PERCENT RETURN		41.4	73.9	57.7

*Sent only to those who had responded to Round 1

**Sent to all 111 designees

In the following eight tables, the upper quartile-ranked information factors are identified for each decision area. The tables have been arranged in the order in which the decision areas appear in Communication No. 3.

TABLE IV

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS RELATING TO PROGRAM GOALS

Rank	Number[1]	Information Factor
* 1	19	Knowledge of subject materials
2	1	Administrative and board commitment to occupational education
3	5	Community needs (to include manpower supply, job availability, labor market analysis, job requirements, employer demands, special populations, etc.)
4	17	Relationship existing between education and industry
5	10	Programs needed to make the offerings sufficiently extensive to meet industrial and student needs

*Factor submitted by an individual at Round 2 which was added data in Round 3 for participants to re-evaluate

[1]Refers to the information factor number used in Communication No. 3

TABLE V

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATING TO ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Rank	Number	Information Factor
* 1	36	Procedures to inform Advisory Committee members of the institution's capabilities: its potentials and its limitations
2	30	Faculty attitude toward meeting with and accepting recommendations from the Advisory Committee
3	27	The attitude of leaders in business and industry toward updating and improving personnel in their fields
4	24	Procedures for dissemination of information about occupational programs to the community
5.5	22	Communications procedures and techniques between the Advisory Committees, administration, and faculty
5.5	34	Procedures for Advisory Committee members to provide assistance in student and graduate placement

*Factor submitted by an individual at Round 2 which was added data in Round 3 for all participants to re-evaluate.

TABLE VI

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATING TO PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Rank	Number	Information Factor
1	40	Commitment of Board and top administration to occupational education
2	56	Knowledge of anticipated technological and industrial job requirements
3	45	Facilities and equipment required and available to meet program objectives
4	37	Community needs--current and anticipated
5	44	Number and qualifications for faculty required to accomplish program objectives
6	54	Input from current and former students

TABLE VII

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATED TO OPERATIONAL BUDGET

Rank	Number	Information Factor
1	65	Training needs of the community, county, and state
2	64	Administrative attitudes toward providing financial support of occupational programs
3	84	Staffing requirements (the number of instructors available and needed, areas of expertise, paraprofessionals, aides, readers, clerical, secretarial, etc.)
4.5	67	Present condition and availability of instructional equipment as it reflects the equipment used in industry
4.5	79	Total district budget plan
6.5	66	Long-range community needs mirrored by planned program changes
6.5	86	Attitude of administration regarding part-time/hourly staffing patterns
8.5	70	Minimum and maximum equipment needs to accomplish goals and objectives of program
8.5	91	Program priorities
10.5	72	Identified work experience and practicum sites
10.5	81	Basis on which funds are to be allocated
12.0	92	Estimates of anticipated program growth
13.0	62	Recommendations and approval from Advisory Committee
14.0	61	Cost of equipment
15.0	96	Placement of the chief administrator for occupational education on the organizational chart

TABLE VIII

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATED TO PROGRAM PLANNING

Rank	Number	Information Factor
1	100	Board and top administrators' commitment to occupational education
2	116	Changes anticipated in the job market
3	111	Evidence of faculty expertise as demonstrated by skill competencies, relationships with occupational field, and knowledge of job market requirements, etc.
4	101	Program approval by Advisory Committees
5	108	Projected Facility and equipment needs

TABLE IX

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATED TO EVALUATION

Rank	Number	Information Factor
*1	139	Procedures and criteria for employed former students' input
2	130	Follow-up information (enrollments, retention, placement, levels of training, abilities, student occupational goals and objectives, graduates, drop-outs, job-outs, completers, entering trade for which trained, successes, etc.)
3	133	Employer feedback (attitudes toward evaluation of training programs, satisfaction with student employees, etc.)
4	121	Input from Advisory Committee into program evaluation
5	122	Knowledge of the requirements of various accrediting agencies (COPES, Trade Licensing, Western States Accreditation Association, district and national certifying examinations, etc.

*Factor submitted by an individual at Round 2 which was added data for Round 3 for all participants to re-evaluate.

TABLE X

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATED TO COORDINATION AND DIRECTION

Rank	Number	Information Factor
1	150	Employer feedback
2	156	Availability of qualified interested instructors for ongoing coordination and direction of occupational education
3	142	Administrative and Board commitment to ongoing functioning of occupational programs
4	164	Evidence that the vocational deans are involved in top-level decision-making planning about occupational education
5	144	Recommendations from the Advisory Committee
6	155	Release time allocated to coordination and direction of occupational programs
7	149	Community needs (information and projections of business and industry, population shifts--economic conditions and trends, etc.)
8	172	Student information (enrollments, desires, needs, placement and retention in industry, evaluation, demand, etc.)
10	154	Yearly evaluations to determine progress in meeting the goals and objectives (identification and removal of blockages, etc.)
10	161	Commitment of the administration to support faculty in-service training programs (district workshops, statewide seminars, national conferences, return-to-industry subsidies, planned summer government positions, etc.)
10	168	Availability of flexible, open-ended programs accommodating a student shift in occupational goals with a minimal time loss

TABLE XI

UPPER QUARTILE RANKED INFORMATION FACTORS
RELATING TO EMPHASIS ON OCCUPATIONAL
COUNSELING, GUIDANCE AND PLACEMENT

Rank	Number	Information Factor
1	187	Qualifications for occupational counseling (attitudes, responsibilities, duties, etc.)
2	179	Institutional commitment to establish an occupational information system to guide students
3.5	191	Provisions for supportive staff requirements (clerical, secretarial, aides, etc.)
3.5	193	Student needs met and unmet (number of occupational students, day/evening makeup, occupational objectives, needs, desires, abilities, etc.)
6.5	181	Evidence of effective liaison between community college counselors and high school counselors, Advisory Committees, occupational faculty, 4-year transfer occupational programs, etc.
6.5	182	Knowledge of community agencies providing occupational counseling, guidance, and placement services.
6.5	186	Attitude of occupational faculty toward working with counselors
6.5	189	Coordination of placement services with: all occupational programs, counselors from other districts and campuses, the community, students, faculty, etc.

Community College Rankings

For each information factor, its overall ranking, as well as its independent ranking by college, is provided in Table XII.

TABLE XII

OVERALL RANK ORDER OF EACH INFORMATION FACTOR BY COLLEGE

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.0	Program Objectives	40	Commitment of board and administration to occupational education	2.0	1.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.5
2.0	Operational Budget	100	Board and top administrator's commitment to occupational education	2.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5
3.0	Program Goals	19	Knowledge of subject materials	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	2.5	27.0
4.0	Program Goals	1	Administrative and board commitment to occupational education	2.0	4.5	6.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	5.0	2.5
5.0	Program Planning	139	Procedures and criteria for employed former student's input	5.5	1.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	6.0	4.0	27.0
6.0	Advisory Committees	36	Procedures to inform advisory committee members of the institution's capabilities: its potential and its limitations	5.5	14.5	3.0	3.5	28.0	5.0	6.5	15.0
7.5	Operational Budget	65	The training needs of the community, county, and state	9.5	14.5	17.5	7.0	21.0	16.5	6.5	15.0
7.5	Coord. and Direction	150	Employer feedback	7.0	7.0	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
9.5 9.5	Operational Budget	64	Administrative attitudes toward providing financial support of occupational education	9.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	9.5	15.0
9.5	Coord. and Direction	156	Availability of qualified interested instructors for ongoing coordination and direction of occupational education	14.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	9.5	15.0
12.5	Program Objectives	56	Knowledge of anticipated technological and industrial job requirements	9.5	22.0	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
12.5	Program Planning	116	Changes anticipated in the job market	14.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	9.5	15.0
12.5	Program Planning	130	Follow-up information (enrollments, retention, placements, levels of training, abilities, studen occupational goals and objectives, graduates, drop-outs, completers, entering trade for which trained, successes, etc.)	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	10.0	7.5	18.5	15.0
12.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	187	Qualifications for occupational counseling (attitudes, responsibilities, duties, etc.)	14.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
15.5	Program Objectives	45	Facilities and equipment required and available to meet program objectives	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0

TABLE XII (CONTINUED)

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15.5	Operational Budget	84	Staffing requirements (the number of instructors available and needed, areas of expertise, paraprofessionals, aides, readers, clerical, secretarial, etc.)	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
18.5	Advisory Committees	30	Faculty attitude toward meeting with and accepting recommendations from the advisory committee	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
18.5	Program Objectives	37	Community needs--current and anticipated	21.5	22.0	17.5	18.0	10.0	7.5	26.0	15.0
18.5	Coord. and Direction	142	Administrative and board commitment to ongoing functioning of occupational programs	9.5	26.0	17.5	18.0	10.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
18.5	Coord. and Direction	179	The institutional commitment to establish an occupational information system to guide students	14.5	24.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	9.5	15.0
21.5	Program Planning	111	Evidence of faculty expertise as demonstrated by skill competencies, relationships with occupational field, and knowledge of job market requirements, etc.	21.5	7.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	25.0	18.5	15.0
21.5	Program Planning	133	Employer feedback (attitudes toward evaluation of training programs, satisfaction with student employees, etc.)	14.5	7.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	18.5	106.5
23.0	Advisory Committees	27	Attitude of leaders in business and industry toward updating and improving personnel in their fields	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	27.0	15.0
24.0	Program Planning	121	Input from advisory committees into program evaluation	21.5	14.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	26.5	18.5	15.0
25.0	Program Planning	101	Program approval by advisory committees	26.5	26.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
26.0	Coord. and Direction	164	Evidence that the vocational deans are involved in top-level, decision-making planning about occupational education	28.0	26.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	16.5	18.5	15.0
27.0	Coord. and Direction	144	Recommendations from the advisory committee	14.5	29.5	17.5	18.0	21.0	26.5	18.5	15.0
28.0	Program Goals	5	Community needs (to include manpower supply, job availability, labor market analysis, job requirements, employer demands, special populations etc.)	26.5	22.0	17.5	18.0	21.0	28.0	28.0	15.0

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
30.0	Program Goals	17	Relationship existing between education and industry	32.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	29.5	66.5
30.0	Program Planning	108	Projected facility and equipment needs	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	29.5	66.5
30.0	Coord. and Direction	155	Release time allocated to coordination and direction of occupational programs	29.0	104.5	68.5	68.0	29.5	39.5	36.5	66.5
33.0	Program Goals	10	Programs needed to make the offerings sufficiently extensive to meet industrial and student needs	32.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	32.0	59.5	66.5
33.0	Program Objectives	44	Number and qualifications for faculty required to accomplish program objectives	81.0	29.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	29.0	45.0	66.5
33.0	Program Planning	107	Knowledge of trade licensing requirements, local, state and national accrediting agency standards, state and federal legal requirements, etc.	41.5	29.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	31.5	66.5
35.5	Program Goals	14	Student needs met and unmet (recruitment and selection, vocational counseling needs, placement, needs, interests, desires, former, current, potential, mobility, etc.)	32.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	32.0	45.0	66.5
35.5	Program Planning	122	Knowledge of the requirements of various accrediting agencies (COPES, trade licensing, Western States Accreditation Association, district and national certifying examinations, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	32.0	31.5	137.5
37.5	Operational Budget	67	Present condition and availability of instructional equipment as it reflects the equipment used in industry	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	36.5	66.5
37.5	Operational Budget	79	Total district budget plan	30.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
40.5	Program Objectives	54	Input from current and former students	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	39.5	59.5	66.5
40.5	Operational Budget	66	Long-range community needs mirrored by planned program changes	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	36.5	66.5
40.5	Operational Budget	86	The attitude of the administration regarding part-time/hourly staffing patterns	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	36.5	66.5
40.5	Coord. and Direction	149	Community needs (information and projections of business and industry, population shifts, economic conditions and trends, etc.)	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	39.5	45.0	66.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
45.0	Program Objectives	42	Evidence of reaching program objectives	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	45.0	66.5
45.0	Program Planning	106	Assessment of all vocational programs available in the community	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	39.5	36.5	66.5
45.0	Coord. and Direction	172	Student information (enrollments, desires, needs, placement and retention in industry, evaluation, demand, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	39.5	59.5	66.5
45.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	191	Provisions for supportive staff requirements (clerical, secretarial, aides, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
45.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	193	Student needs met and unmet (number of occupational students, day/evening makeup, occupational objectives, needs, desires, abilities, etc.)	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	39.5	45.0	66.5
54.0	Operational Budget	70	Minimum and maximum equipment needs to accomplish goals and objectives of program	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
54.0	Operational Budget	91	Program priorities	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	45.0	66.5
54.0	Program Planning	115	Student needs (desires, interests, supply, selection, demand, projections, successes, completers, evaluations, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	39.5	45.0	66.5
54.0	Program Planning	118	Available facilities, equipment, and instructional supplies (texts, audio-visual, software, etc.)	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	100.0	36.5	66.5
54.0	Program Planning	132	Knowledge of use to be made of evaluations	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	39.5	82.0	66.5
54.0	Program Planning	134	Criteria for and measurement of job success	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	39.5	82.0	66.5
54.0	Coord. and Direction	154	Yearly evaluations to determine progress in meeting the goals and objectives (identification and removal of blockages, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	32.0	82.0	66.5
54.0	Coord. and Direction	161	Commitment of the administration to support faculty in-service training programs (district workshops, statewide seminars, national conferences, return-to-industry subsidies, planned summer government positions, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
54.0	Coord. and Direction	168	The availability of flexible, open-ended programs accommodating a student shift in occupational goals with a minimal time loss	57.5	97.0	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	59.5	66.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
54.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	181	Evidence of effective liaison between community college counselors, advisory committees, occupational faculty, 4-year transfer occupational programs, etc.)	32.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	100.0	66.5
54.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	182	Knowledge of community agencies providing occupational counseling, guidance, and placement services	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
54.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	186	Attitude of occupational faculty toward working with counselors	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
54.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	189	Coordination of placement services with all occupational programs, counselors from other districts and campuses, the community, students, faculty, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Program Objectives	39	Community input (advisory committee, etc.)	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	102.0	36.5	66.5
67.5	Operational Budget	72	Identified work experience and practicum sites	57.5	97.0	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Operational Budget	81	Basis on which funds are to be allocated	57.5	97.0	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
67.5	Program Planning	103	Community needs met and unmet	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	45.0	66.5
67.5	Program Planning	105	Program guidelines (scope, content. time, etc.)	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
67.5	Program Planning	127	Knowledge of the goals and specific objectives from each occupational area	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	39.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Program Planning	135	Availability of job-focus information from former students in relation to instructional programs	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Program Planning	137	Knowledge of who has the responsibility and authority for data collection	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Coord. and Direction	143	Administrative feedback	41.5	97.0	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
67.5	Coord. and Direction	158	Locations of new types of work stations to fit new occupational programs	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	96.0	66.5
67.5	Coord. and Direction	160	The institutional financial commitment to the needs of special student populations	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
67.5	Coord. and Direction	166	Evidence of the capabilities of a management team to carry out the direction and coordination of occupational education (coordinators, curriculum committees, faculty, division and department heads, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
67.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	190	The role of placement services (careers, temporary employment, graduates, jobouts, work experience, part-time, specific programs, accessibility, processing job requests, recruitment, etc.)	41.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	100.0	66.5
67.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac	192	Evidence that students of all ability levels are being served	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
79.0	Program Goals	6	Facilities needed and available	98.0	63.5	29.0	68.0	39.5	71.5	96.0	66.5
79.0	Operational Budget	92	Estimates of anticipated program growth	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
79.0	Program Planning	102	Recommendations from advisory committees	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
79.0	Program Planning	120	Procedures for implementing recommendations for changes in occupational programs	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
79.0	Program Planning	132	Evidence of growth and modification of offerings over the past five years (levels and amounts of skill needed, most appropriate types of training, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
79.0	Program Planning	140	Evidence of continuing review of all occupational programs (elimination of duplications, identifying uniquenesses, examinations of past performances, e.g. placements, completion rates, relevancy, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
79.0	Coord. and Direction	146	Knowledge of all community occupational training programs and the impact on each other (feeder high schools, transfer institutions, ROP'S, private institutions, duplications, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
79.0	Coord. and Direction	157	Knowledge of the availability and appropriateness of campus and community facilities	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
79.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	188	Changes in the labor market requiring in-service training for counselors	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
86.5	Advisory Committees	24	Procedures for dissemination of information about occupational programs to the community	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	103.5	66.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
86.5	Operational Budget	51	Knowledge of components of program objectives (degree requirements, length of program, specific skills, levels, related learnings, and cluster areas)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
86.5	Operational Budget	62	Recommendations and approval from the advisory committee	81.0	97.0	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
86.5	Program Planning	124	Effectiveness of facilities (flexibility, utilization, adequacy, comparisons, etc.)	98.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
86.5	Program Planning	145	Working effectiveness of the advisory committee with other program components	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	96.0	66.5
86.5	Coord. and Direction	162	Availability of supplemental educational materials (texts, audio-visual, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
91.5	Advisory Committees	22	Communications procedures and techniques between the advisory committees, administration, and faculty	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	100.0	66.5
91.5	Advisory Committees	34	Procedures for advisory committee members to provide assistance to student and graduate placements	98.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
91.5	Program Planning	141	Information needs of board members and administrators about occupational education (content, competencies, conceptual)	57.5	112.0	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	36.5	66.5
91.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	180	Recommendations from the advisory committee	81.0	100.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
95.0	Advisory Committees	25	Membership selection process (representativeness of occupational areas, scope of area, levels--supervisory, secretarial, employers--students, faculty, characteristics--interest, perceptive, creative, etc.)	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	59.5	71.5	103.5	66.5
95.0	Program Planning	117	Availability of resource people with planning expertise to assist with planning and developing programs	81.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.0	100.0	82.0	66.5
95.0	Coord. and Direction	167	Evidence of a centralization of authority, overall program management, and accountability for occupational education into a single individual at the dean's level	101.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	82.0	66.5
98.0	Program Objectives	41	Cost analysis of program objectives	98.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	100.0	100.0	66.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
98.0	Operational Budget	61	Cost of equipment	98.0	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	71.5	100.0	66.5
98.0	Program Planning	136	Attitudes of faculty, administration, students, advisory committees, employers, and community toward evaluation of occupational education	57.5	63.5	68.5	68.0	86.5	104.0	82.0	66.5
100.0	Coord. and Direction	159	Availability of state and federal funds to meet the goals and objectives of each occupational program	81.0	29.5	68.5	68.0	106.0	71.5	108.0	66.5
101.0	Program Objectives	43	Faculty input (curriculum committee, etc.)	103.0	100.5	68.5	68.0	40.5	104.0	45.0	66.5
102.0	Operational Budget	96	Placement of the chief administrator for occupational education on the organizational chart	105.0	139.5	68.5	68.0	29.5	32.0	82.0	66.5
103.0	Program Planning	97	Societal benefits gained from occupational programs	81.0	139.5	68.5	68.0	117.5	71.5	59.5	66.5
104.0	Program Goals	2	Costs of establishing and maintaining programs for occupational education	103.0	32.0	68.5	68.0	40.5	71.5	148.5	66.5
105.0	Program Goals	3	Input from advisory committee	103.0	112.0	68.5	68.0	86.5	112.5	59.5	66.5
106.0	Program Objectives	47	Knowledge of most appropriate organizational structure to allow the accomplishment of program objectives	108.5	112.0	139.5	136.0	143.5	112.5	82.0	137.5
107.0	Program Objectives	49	The availability of work experience opportunities for most students	108.5	102.0	139.5	136.0	117.5	112.5	115.0	137.5
108.0	Program Goals	4	Knowledge of program offerings at feeder high schools, 4-year transfer institutions, private schools, and other educational agencies	115.5	112.0	139.5	68.0	86.5	112.5	135.5	137.5
109.0	Coord. and Direction	175	The philosophy and purpose of the institution and occupational education's place in the overall educational scheme	108.5	104.5	110.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	111.5	137.5
111.0	Program Goals	7	Faculty input	123.0	112.0	139.5	136.0	106.0	160.5	105.0	137.5
111.0	Program Planning	128	Identification of occupational program manager on an organizational level commensurate with defined management function and on a lateral level with other managers who have equivalent responsibilities and authority	135.0	63.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	111.5	137.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
111.0	Coord. and Direction	177	Knowledge of the faculty's teaching goals and objectives to be able to make decisions about coordination and direction of occupational education	123.0	139.5	110.5	136.0	143.5	104.0	118.5	137.5
113.0	Program Objectives	53	Student characteristics (types, background, needs, expectations, aspirations, goals, etc.)	123.0	139.5	107.5	136.0	117.5	108.0	156.5	137.5
115.0	Program Objectives	59	Knowledge of how to write program objectives	108.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	139.0	124.0	137.5
115.0	Program Objectives	60	Long-range manpower projection from industry to determine long-range need for program	123.0	112.0	139.5	136.0	117.5	139.0	115.0	137.5
115.0	Operational Budget	85	Student/teacher ratio for all occupational programs	148.5	139.5	30.0	136.0	164.0	139.0	108.0	137.5
118.5	Program Goals	12	Knowledge of legal requirements for employability and upward mobility	148.5	112.0	139.5	136.0	130.0	139.0	108.0	137.5
118.5	Advisory Committees	28	Faculty input to the advisory committee (reports, recommendations, etc.)	123.0	162.0	139.5	136.0	117.5	118.0	118.5	137.5
118.5	Program Planning	109	Yearly evaluations to determine progress of program plans	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	108.0	115.0	137.5
118.5	Coord. and Direction	153	Input from faculty (individuals, divisions, departments, committees--esp. the curriculum committee, etc.)	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	118.0	115.0	137.5
122.5	Program Goals	15	Knowledge of how to translate ideas, comments, etc., into usable, realistic goal statements	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	130.0	156.5	108.0	137.5
122.5	Operational Budget	71	Suitability and availability of facilities including alternative locations	108.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	130.0	139.0	135.5	137.5
122.5	Program Planning	114	Student/teacher ratios for programs	123.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	108.0	137.5
122.5	Program Planning	125	Negotiated and agreed-upon performance objectives for occupational education faculty evaluation of teaching excellence (classroom visitations, professional reading, etc.)	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	108.5	118.0	124.0	137.5
126.0	Program Objectives	52	Number of available and committed occupational students	148.5	139.5	139.5	68.0	130.0	139.0	124.0	137.5
126.0	Operational Budget	80	Capital outlay formula	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	106.0	139.0	135.5	137.5
126.0	Coord. and Direction	152	Evidence that curriculum changes are being made	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	108.5	118.0	148.5	137.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
131.0	Program Goals	11	The availability of programs at different preparation levels (entry, upgrading, promotional, retraining, etc.)	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	139.0	124.0	137.5
131.0	Program Objectives	57	Input based on research findings	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	118.0	148.5	137.5
131.0	Operational Budget	82	Cost analysis of each occupational program	123.0	139.5	110.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	135.5	137.5
131.0	Operational Budget	88	The projected needs for program materials to meet program goals and objectives (texts, references, supplies, etc.)	112.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	135.5	137.5
131.0	Operational Budget	90	The attitude of the administration toward in-service educational opportunities (conference attendance, curriculum development, work experience, etc.)	108.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	148.5	137.5
131.0	Operational Budget	98	Student information (enrollments, demand, abilities, interest, costs, graduates, placements, etc.)	148.5	104.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	118.0	135.5	137.5
131.0	Program Planning	104	Needs assessment of identified target populations (disadvantaged, handicapped, minorities, other special populations)	115.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	124.0	137.5
137.0	Program Objectives	58	Procedures for dissemination of program objectives information	115.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	160.5	135.5	137.5
137.0	Operational Budget	93	Historical data for ongoing program (enrollments, placements, budget costs, etc.)	148.5	112.0	139.5	136.0	117.5	139.0	135.5	137.5
137.0	Program Planning	131	Procedures for student evaluation of instruction	158.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	108.0	135.5	137.5
137.0	Coord. and Direction	147	Availability of jobs to accomodate handicaps of individuals	112.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	135.5	137.5
137.0	Coord. and Direction	165	Evidence of occupational program's fit into the career-ladder concept	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	108.0	148.5	137.5
140.5	Program Objectives	50	The relationship of various instructional strategies to accomplish program objectives	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	160.5	124.0	137.5
140.5	Program Objectives	55	Compatability of anticipated programs, with existing programs	123.0	112.0	139.5	136.0	166.5	156.5	115.0	137.5
144.0	Advisory Committees	20	Administrative and board policy toward advisory committees (calling for membership, establishing goals, paying travel costs of members, etc.	123.0	139.5	168.0	136.0	157.5	139.0	136.5	27.0
144.0	Program Objectives	46	Changes requiring in-service training	148.5	112.0	139.5	136.0	143.5	112.5	148.5	137.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
144.0	Operational Budget	83	Salary schedule criteria	158.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	130.0	139.0	124.0	137.5
144.0	Operational Budget	99	Procedures for communication between the Purchasing Department and faculty (providing updated budget balances, notification of changes and alterations in original requests, etc.)	123.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	148.5	137.5
144.0	Program Planning	123	The cost/effectiveness of occupational programs	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	108.0	156.5	137.5
147.5	Advisory Committees	23	Procedures for evaluating the activities of the advisory committee	158.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	130.0	139.0	135.5	137.5
147.5	Advisory Committees	26	Procedures to inform members of their role on the committee (obtaining commitment, expectations: suggesting, advising, recommending, approving, etc.)	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	139.0	159.5	137.5
150.5	Operational Budget	73	Former student evaluation of equipment and facilities used in their preparation	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	156.5	137.5
150.5	Program Planning	129	Identify where in the organizational hierarchy and with whom the responsibility for evaluation resides	115.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	159.5	137.5
150.5	Coord. and Direction	174	Knowledge of the student flow through occupational programs at all educational levels and institutions (high school, adult school, community college, 4-year transfer institutions, private schools, etc.)	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	148.5	137.5
150.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	183	Procedures and instruments for objective and subjective student evaluations of occupational counseling, guidance, and placement programs	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	148.5	137.5
154.0	Program Planning	112	Expenses and income generated by each occupational program--present and projected relationships to the institution's financial status	135.0	104.5	139.5	136.0	164.0	139.0	148.5	174.5
154.0	Program Planning	113	Knowledge of Master Vocational Education Plan	123.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	124.0	137.5
154.0	Coord. and Direction	148	Needs of special student populations (equipment, facilities, satisfactory academic achievements, placements, etc.)	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	157.5	139.0	148.5	137.5
156.5	Program Goals	8	Changes which reflect in-service training needs	162.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	160.5	148.5	137.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
156.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	194	Comparisons of the effectiveness of different training methods	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	130.0	164.0	135.5	137.5
158.5	Operational Budget	68	The ratio of equipment/student usage	158.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	122.0	167.5	137.5
158.5	Program Planning	119	Evidence of interdisciplinary planning of campus resources and services into existing occupational programs	162.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	117.5	160.5	156.5	137.5
160.0	Operational Budget	76	Normal operating expenses per occupational class section	148.5	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	139.0	164.5	137.5
161.0	Operational Budget	78	Projected income and expenses of each occupational instructional area	135.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	164.0	139.0	164.5	137.5
162.0	Advisory Committees	21	Input of advisory committee at all administrative levels (including reporting directly to the board, etc.)	162.0	139.5	139.5	136.0	143.5	165.5	135.5	137.5
163.0	Coord. and Direction	170	Evidence of strong leadership from the Chancellor's office in establishing needs and priorities	158.0	167.5	139.5	136.5	130.0	118.0	164.5	137.5
164.0	Operational Budget	75	Income generated by VEA entitlement foundation	164.0	179.5	110.5	181.5	143.5	139.0	164.5	137.5
165.0	Program Planning	110	Faculty input (individuals, departments, divisions, committees--esp. the curriculum committee, etc.)	165.5	163.5	113.0	172.5	143.5	165.5	161.5	106.5
166.0	Program Goals	16	Philosophy and purpose of the institution	167.0	167.5	107.5	172.5	166.5	168.0	124.0	106.5
167.0	Program Goals	9	Availability of private, public, and campus placement services	165.5	182.0	167.0	172.5	169.5	160.5	181.5	106.5
168.0	Operational Budget	69	Replacement schedules	174.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	157.5	175.0	161.5	174.5
169.0	Operational Budget	74	Income generated by ADA	168.0	112.0	175.5	136.0	169.5	184.5	175.0	174.5
170.0	Coord. and Direction	171	State standards and guidelines for coordination and direction of occupational education (State Vocational Plan, Education Code, other legislative measures, procedural requirements, etc.)	170.0	182.0	175.5	172.5	173.0	175.0	167.5	174.5
171.5	Advisory Committees	33	Student input to the advisory committee	181.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	173.0	170.0	169.0	167.0
171.5	Program Objectives	48	Knowledge of requirements from state licensing agencies, 4-year transferring institutions, national accrediting agencies, etc.	174.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	169.5	168.0	175.0	174.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
174.0	Advisory Committees	29	Faculty membership in community organizations	178.0	167.5	175.5	172.5	173.0	175.0	175.0	174.5
174.0	Operational Budget	95	Number of different occupational classes and sections offered	178.0	167.5	175.5	172.5	175.5	175.0	172.0	174.5
174.0	Coord. and Direction	163	Mileage costs relative to vocational programs	170.0	182.0	175.5	172.5	179.0	175.0	170.0	174.5
177.0	Advisory Committees	32	The logistics of advisory committee meetings (time, place, length, agenda items, regularity, etc.)	178.0	167.5	175.5	172.5	179.0	175.0	179.0	174.5
177.0	Advisory Committees	35	Procedures for the advisory committee to conduct surveys, studies, and research projects	178.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	169.5	175.0	179.0	174.5
177.0	Operational Budget	89	Library resources	172.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	175.5	180.5	175.0	174.5
179.0	Program Planning	126	Evidence of an increase in the number of performance objectives established for faculty evaluation	182.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	177.0	168.0	171.0	174.5
180.5	Advisory Committees	31	The organizational structure of the advisory committee (state guidelines, size, representativeness, chairing, etc.)	178.0	167.5	175.5	172.5	179.0	175.0	179.0	174.5
180.5	Coord. and Direction	176	Criteria for determining whether or not the institution has reached its growth potential	178.0	174.0	175.5	172.5	179.0	175.0	175.0	174.5
182.0	Program Goals	13	Knowledge of accreditation requirements	170.5	179.5	185.5	186.5	182.5	183.0	181.5	181.5
183.0	Operational Budget	87	The cost per student by program	184.5	185.0	166.0	186.5	190.0	189.5	184.0	186.5
184.0	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	184	Cost/benefits analysis of occupational guidance and counseling	186.0	178.0	185.5	186.5	185.5	182.0	185.0	186.5
185.0	Coord. and Direction	169	Criteria to be used to inauguate duplicate programs on another campus within the district	183.0	188.5	185.5	186.5	184.0	180.5	189.0	186.5
186.0	Coord. and Direction	173	The ratio of number of students per coordinator	181.5	188.5	185.5	186.5	188.0	186.5	183.0	186.5
187.5	Coord. and Direction	179	Credential requirements for salary increments	188.0	185.0	185.5	186.5	185.5	186.5	188.0	186.5
187.5	Occ. Coun. Guid./Plac.	185	Availability of financial resources outside the institution for occupational guidance and counseling	187.0	185.0	185.5	186.5	188.0	189.0	187.0	186.5
189.0	Operational Budget	77	Funding from external sources (grants, donations, etc.)	189.0	188.5	189.0	186.5	182.5	189.0	186.0	186.5

OVERALL RANK	DECISION AREA	FACTOR NUMBER	FACTOR	COLLEGE RANK 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
190.0	Operational Budget	63	Relative costs of occupational courses compared with costs of liberal arts courses	190.0	188.5	192.0	181.5	192.0	189.0	190.0	182.0
191.0	Program Goals	18	Knowledge of unemployment and welfare benefits in relation to earnings potential afforded students by existing programs	191.5	191.0	190.5	191.5	188.0	192.0	191.0	191.5
192.0	Coord. and Direction	151	Awareness of parents' wants	191.5	192.0	190.5	191.5	191.0	191.0	193.0	193.0
193.0	Operational Budget	94	The relationship between the number of new classes opening in liberal arts areas as compared to the number of new new-class starts for occupational areas	193.0	194.0	193.5	193.5	194.0	194.0	192.0	191.5
194.0	Program Objectives	38	Parental wishes	194.0	193.0	193.5	193.5	193.0	193.0	194.0	194.0

Governance

In Communication No. 1, the first question asked about the decision area was "At what administrative level is the decision(s) made about (named decision area) for occupational education?" To provide some insight into the responses, it is necessary to first examine the formal organizational structure of the institution as outlined on its organizational chart. Organizational charts, supplied by the chief occupational administrators, were used to develop the data in Table XIII. The only commonality existing in all institutions was the Board of Trustees as the top level in the hierarchical structure. From this point, the flow downward was from a superintendent, president, chancellor, or a combination, to vice-presidents or deans through associate or assistant deans on to divisions to departments to faculty to students. Because of the differing titles and organizational arrangements, no clear distinction could be identified.

The formal channels for communications for each college have been outlined in Table XIII. The data indicates that, at College 6, the Dean of Occupational Education holds the highest decision-making level as well as maintaining the most direct accessibility to the top-level administrator at the institution. The added support attesting to the strength of the Dean of Occupational Education's position came from a large number of management team members who perceived decisions to be made from the Dean's position. Five of the eight community colleges chart their chief occupational education administrator in areas which have little or no impact with divisions or faculty or students. For colleges 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, there is no direct line with occupational programs.

TABLE XIII

HIEARCHICAL ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS FOR EIGHT DECISION-MAKING LEVELS

Levels	College 1	College 2	College 3	College 4	College 5	College 6	College 7	College 8
1	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees	Bd Trustees
2	Sup't	President	District Chancellor	Sup't/Pres	Chancellor	Sup't	Sup't/Pres	Sup't/Pres
3	President	VP Inst / VP Stu Prsnl	President	Deputy Sup't	President	President	Academic Dean Instr	VP/Dean Instr
4	Dean Instr	DEAN OCC ED	Dean Instr	Academic Dean	VP Operations	DEAN OCC ED	ASS'T DEAN OCC & CAREER ED	Div Chrpns/ Work Exp Coordinators
5	ASS'T DEAN OCC ED / Asso Dean Instr/ Asso Dean Eve	Work Exp Coor / Div Chrpns	ASSO DEAN VO-TECH ED / ASSO DEAN OCC ED		DEAN VOC ED	Ass't Dean Occ Ed	Tchr/ Coords / Dept/ Cluster Chrpns	Chairpersons
6	Div Chrpns	Faculty	Work Exp Coors / Div Chrpn	Div Chrpns	Dept/Div Chrpns	Dept Chrpns	Faculty	Faculty
7	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Dept Chrpns	Faculty	Faculty	Students	Students
8	Students		Students	Faculty	Students	Students		

_____ Indicates the main communication channel on the organizational chart

Decisions--Organizational Levels

The two most frequently mentioned hierarchical levels at each college where decisions were preceived to be made about each decision area have been identified in Table XIV. To summarize, the Dean of Instruction generally is perceived to be the office in which the major decisions about occupational education are made. In three college , 3, 5, and 6, the chief occupational administrator has input into the decision-making activities. In the decision area of Emphasis on Occupational Counseling, Guidance, and Placement, the chief occupational administrator appears not to be involved in the decision-making activities. The heaviest involvement for the chief occupational education administrative office is in relation to the decision

area of Advisory Committees. Two institutions particularly had a number of decision areas where multiple administrative levels were mentioned, apparently it was not known who made the decisions.

TABLE XIV

FIRST AND SECOND MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED HIERARCHICAL DECISION-MAKING LEVELS

Decision Area		College 1	College 2	College 3	College 4	College 5	College 6	College 7	College 8
Program Goals	1st	Staff	Staff	Staff	Staff	Advisory Com	Dept Chrpsn	?	Div Chrpsn & Staff
	2nd	Advisory Com	DEAN OCC ED/ Div Chrpsn/ Advisory Com	?	--	Staff	Coordinators	?	Advisory Com/Curriculum Com
Advisory Committee	1st	DEAN OCC ED/ Div Chrpsn	Staff	Staff	DEAN OCC ED	Coordinators	Dept Chrpsn	Staff	Dept Chrpsn
	2nd	Staff	?	?	Staff	?	Coordinators	?	?
Program Objectives	1st	Staff	Staff	Staff	Staff	Advisory Com	Dept Chrpsn	Staff	Div Chrpsn & Staff
	2nd	Advisory Com	Advisory Com	ASSO DEAN OCC ED	--	Staff	Coordinators	?	Curriculum Com
Operational Budget	1st	Staff	Div Chrpsn	Div Chrpsn	Div Chrpsn	DEAN OCC ED/ Dept Chrpsn/ Advisory Com	Dept Chrpsn/ Staff	Dean Instr/ ASS'T DEAN OCC ED	Div Chrpsn
	2nd	Div Chrpsn	Staff	?	--	?	?	?	Staff
Program Planning	1st	Staff/Advisory Com	Div Chrpsn/ Staff	?	?	Advisory Com	Dept Chrpsn	Staff	Staff/Advisory Com
	2nd	DEAN OCC ED	Advisory Com	?	?	District Coordinator	Coordinator	ASS'T DEAN OCC ED	?
Evaluation	1st	Staff	Staff	?	--	DEAN OCC ED	Dept Chrpsn	Staff	Staff/Students
	2nd	DEAN OCC ED/ Advisory Com	Advisory Com	?	--	Staff/Advisory Com	?	Employers	?
Program Coordination & Direction	1st	Staff	Div Chrpsn	?	?	DEAN OCC ED/ Coordinators	Dept Chrpsn/ Coordinators	Staff	?
	2nd	Dean Instr/ Div Chrpsn Advisory Com	?	?	?	Dept Chrpsn	--	?	?
Occupational Counseling, Guidance, and Placement	1st	Staff/Counseling Staff	Staff	Staff	?	Dean Studnt Prsnl/DEAN OCC ED/ Counseling Staff	Dept Chrpsn/ Counseling Staff	?	?
	2nd	Students' Evaluation	DEAN OCC ED	?	?	Counseling Staff	?	?	?

--No alternatives given
? No discernible level evident

Recommendations--Organizational Levels

The second question asked in Communication No. 1 pertained to who was perceived to make recommendations for each of the decision-making areas. Table XV provides a matrix of the first and second most frequently mentioned hierarchical levels at which recommendations about each of the decision areas were perceived to have been made. The instructors are the most frequently mentioned group as the source of recommendations in all colleges of the study. The Division/Department Chairmen and the Advisory Committees are the next two groups mentioned most frequently. The chief occupational administrators are the most frequently mentioned hierarchical level for recommendations by management team members from four colleges in three decision areas: Advisory Committees, 2 colleges; Evaluation, 1 college; and Operational Budget, 1 college. One college team viewed the Dean of Occupational Education, the Department Chairmen, and the Advisory Committees as having equal impact for recommendations. A similar perception was recorded for another college in the Occupational Counseling, Guidance, and Placement decision area.

TABLE XV

FIRST AND SECOND MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED HIEARCHICAL RECOMMENDATION-MAKING LEVELS

Decision Area		College 1	College 2	College 3	College 4	College 5	College 6	College 7	College 8
Program Goals	1st	Bd Trustees	President	Dean Instr	Deputy Sup't Dean Academic Services	Top Admin	DEAN OCC ED	Div Chrpns	Dean Instr
	2nd	Dean Instr	Div Chrpsn	President		DEAN OCC ED	Dean Instr	Top Admin	Bd Trustees
Advisory Committee	1st	ASS'T DEAN OCC ED	DEAN OCC ED	Asso Dean Instr	Sup't/Pres	District Off	DEAN OCC ED	ASS'T DEAN OCC ED	Dean Instr
	2nd	Div Chrpns	Div Chrpns	Dean Instr	Bd Trustees	Dean Instr	Dean Instr	---	Bd Trustees
Program Objs	1st	Dean Instr	Div Chrpns	---	Faculty	DEAN OCC ED	?	---	Dean Instr
	2nd	Div Chrpns	---	---	---	District Off	?		---
Operatnl Budget	1st	Dean Instr	VP Business	ASSO DEAN OCC ED	President	Top Admin	DEAN OCC ED	Dean Instr	Dean Instr
	2nd	Sup't/Pres	?	?	---	DEAN OCC ED	?	?	?
Program Planning	1st	Dean Instr	?	Dean Instr	Top Admin	District Off	DEAN OCC ED	?	Dean Instr
	2nd	District Off	?	ASSO DEAN OCC ED	---	Faculty & Advisory Com	?	?	---
Evaluation	1st	Dean Instr	VP Instr	Top Admin	President	?	DEAN OCC ED	?	Dean Instr
	2nd	Div Chrpns/ Faculty	DEAN OCC ED	---	---	?	?	?	Sup't/Pres
Coordination & Direction	1st	Dean Instr	VP Instr	ASSO DEAN OCC ED	?	Coordinators	?	?	Dean Instr
	2nd	District Off	DEAN OCC ED	Dean Instr	?	?	?	?	---
Occ Counslg/ Guid & Placmt Personnel	1st	District Off Dean Stu	Dean Stu Personnel	?	President	Dean Stu Personnel	?	Counseling Staff	?
	2nd	Dean Instr	President	?	Dean Stu Personnel	DEAN OCC ED Coords/Dirtrs	?	?	?

--- No alternatives given ?--No discernible level evident

Commentary on the Governance Patterns Within Colleges

Several comments about the decision area, Program Goals, were submitted with the identification of the decision level. Some suggested that decisions were made at varying levels with ratification at the administrative level followed by a perfunctory decision from the Board of Trustees. Others felt that, at times, unrealistic goals were developed and imposed by the administration. It was suggested that there was an inconsistency within the institution as to where the decision-making level really was. In relation to some occupational areas, decisions were perceived to be made within the area; while other occupational areas either had to accept administratively imposed goals or were in another sense disregarded; "...no one cared," was a telling response.

Management team members from four institutions added their perceptions relating to Program Objectives. The thrust of the perceptions from three institutions was that "Goals are objectives." It was also noted from two colleges, that, other than the published statement of philosophy appearing in the college catalog, no overall written goals were available.

For decision area, Operational Budget, responses from five institutions indicated that the chief occupational administrator had little or no involvement with decisions about occupational education's budget. The most negative comment labeled the deans who work with institution budget as "hatchet men." The chief administrator of occupational education was not perceived as being involved with decision making at that specific college.

Program Planning decision area comments reflected the feeling that this area is more an individual instructor's task than it is an undertaking for the management

team. Members from two institutions felt there was no evidence of planning for occupational education at their colleges.

For the decision area of Evaluation, the comments from five colleges reflected generally negative feelings. The comments ranged from "Don't have a formal method," to "Everyone is up to ears in evaluation because it's useless." Evaluation was also seen as a "string" attached to receipt of state monies.

The added comments for the decision area, Coordination and Direction, were submitted from management team members from five colleges and reflected that decisions were made in the top administrative levels or at the district office. Some felt that there was abdication of responsibility of those who should have been involved. Concern was expressed from five colleges also that the counseling staffs were lacking sufficient information and that this area was the weakest area in the college. That the counselors still directed students more toward the teaching profession was another expressed concern.

Occupational Education Management Teams--A Profile

To gain some insight into the background of the occupational education decision makers, selected information was requested of the participants who responded to Communication No. 3. Sixty-four respondents, 50 men and 14 women, 78.1 and 21.9 percent, completed the majority of items on the profile sheet. The following tables display the selected data.

The present positions, as identified by the participants, were examined for the more commonly accepted occupational identifiers. The composition of the nominated individuals, as shown in Table XVI, indicated that 68.7 percent of the members of management teams were in occupationally oriented positions. For grouping purposes, Division Chairpersons were included with administration; Department Chairpersons were clustered in the instructor category as most had teaching responsibilities.

TABLE XVI

COMPOSITION OF MANAGEMENT TEAMS OCCUPATIONAL AND NON-OCCUPATIONAL

Type	Frequency	Percent
Occupational Administration	26	40.6
Occupational Instructors	18	28.1
Non-Occupational Administration	17	26.6
Non-Occupational Instructors	3	4.7
TOTAL	64	100.0

Table XVII shows the distribution of management team members by title of present position. The Division Chairpersons who responded in the study were about equally divided between an occupational and academic orientation. A separate category was created for those individuals who were Division or Department Chairpersons and who had identified teaching as their first-order responsibility.

TABLE XVII

DISTRIBUTION OF MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS BY TITLES OF PRESENT POSITIONS

Title Present Position		No.	Percent
Dean Occupational Education		2	3.1
Director Occupational Education		1	1.6
Assistant Dean Occupational Education		3	4.7
Associate Dean Occupational Education		2	3.1
Division Chairpersons		12	18.8
Occupationally Related	(7)		
Academically Related	(5)		
Department Chairpersons		11	17.2
Occupationally Related	(11)		
Academically Related	(0)		
Division or Department Chairpersons (combined with major instructional functions)		8	12.5
Occupationally Related	(8)		
Academically Related	(0)		
Instructors		6	9.4
Occupationally Related	(4)		
Academically Related	(2)		
Other*		19	29.7
Department Coordinators	(3)		
Directors	(4)		
President, Vice-President, Assoc./Asst. Deans	(12)		

*In the "Other" category, six of the 19 were classified in occupationally related areas, with 13 individuals in non-occupational areas, representing 20.3 percent of the total respondents.

Data relating to the formal educational background of participants is given in Table XVIII, Under "Special" the individual had the identified vocational electronics area. For "Other" category, graduate student was recorded as no indicated as to what level of graduate student. The diploma conferred for registered nursing accounted for the second person.

TABLE XVIII

FORMAL EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree Held	Frequency	Percent
Bachelors	9	14.1
Masters	38	59.4
Doctorate	14	21.9
Special	1	1.6
Other	2	3.1

A profile of an occupational management team member from the colleges in this study identifies

- a male between 40-49 years of age holding a masters degree
- one who has been in the current occupational administration position between two to five years and is probably a Division Chairperson
- the major responsibility of the position is teaching, with supporting responsibilities in supervision of teachers and program and personnel scheduling
- one who has taught over eleven years in the community college
- one who has had prior administrative experience either from two to five years or over eleven years at the community college level.

CONCLUSIONS

Information Factors

1. The statistical analysis of the data indicated a significantly high relationship between institutions and their occupational management teams' perceived importance of information factors which would be needed and usable for effective planning for occupational education.
2. The rankings given by the teams from the eight institutions indicated information factors relating to commitment and attitudes were most important. Information factors again relating to commitment and attitudes in seven of the eight decision areas were also ranked high.
3. Information factors relating to the product of occupational programs from the viewpoint of the students, the employers, and the advisory committees followed in importance.
4. Community needs, the next broad area for provision of information, includes the geographic area served, the training needs of the job, and the staff qualifications to meet these needs.
5. The emphasis on information factors relating to occupational counseling, guidance, placement, and follow-up is next in importance. Follow-up information becomes the validation of the occupational programs.
6. Information factors relating to facilities, equipment and staffing requirements is the last grouping.
7. Of the eight decision areas, Evaluation received the highest overall ranking.

Governance

1. Based on the analysis of the organizational charts and the responses of those who are perceived to make the decisions, the chief occupational administrator is unlikely to hold a decision-making position.
2. Most of the decisions in relation to occupational education are perceived to be made by the Dean of Instruction.
3. The chief occupational administrator is perceived to make decisions about the advisory committee area.

Profile

1. The typical occupational management team member is a male between 40-49 years of age, who has attained a master's degree, who is likely to have held a Division Chairperson's position for the previous two to five years, who perceives his primary responsibility as teaching with teacher supervision and program and personnel scheduling as supporting responsibilities. This typical team member has been teaching in the community college system over eleven years and has acquired prior administrative experience in the community college system.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the findings of this study be used as a foundation for developing an information base for decision makers for effective planning of occupational education for post-secondary education.
2. An information system to be effective must include information on the commitment and attitudinal dimension. It appears that if one variable were to be selected as indicating the direction and the effectiveness of occupational education, an examination of the value systems of the decision makers is that variable.
3. It is recommended that a developmental program be designed and implemented to bring about an organization-structural shift which would place chief occupational education administrators in a position commensurate with the chief academic administrator.
4. It is recommended that a program be developed and implemented to facilitate establishing occupational program goals and objectives. This is clearly a confused area for most team members.
5. Suggested additional research areas are:
   (1) to develop a model to measure attitude and commitment for occupational education; and
   (2) to develop a simulation model using the major categories of information factors as identified in this study to provide training in decision-making activities.

OE 608 342